

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY,
KENTUCKY ENVIRONMENTAL
FOUNDATION, and SIERRA CLUB,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE, a federal
agency within the United States Department
of Agriculture,

Defendant

No. C-08-1240 MMC

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S
MOTION TO TRANSFER VENUE;
VACATING HEARING**

Before the Court is defendant Rural Utilities Service's motion, filed April 30, 2008 and amended May 7, 2008, to transfer the above-titled action to the District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, or, alternatively, to the District Court for the District of Columbia, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). Plaintiffs Center for Biological Diversity, Kentucky Environmental Foundation, and Sierra Club have filed opposition, to which defendant has replied. Having considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the motion, the Court deems the matter appropriate for decision on the papers, VACATES the hearing scheduled for June 27, 2008, and as set forth below, the Court finds, for the reasons stated by defendant in its motion, the instant action should be transferred to the Eastern District of Kentucky, pursuant to § 1404(a).¹

¹ In light of this finding, the Court does not consider East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc.'s motion to intervene, also noticed for hearing on June 27, 2008. Such motion may be renoticed for hearing before the transferee court.

1 In particular, because plaintiffs seek judicial review of defendant's decision regarding
 2 "two new . . . combustion turbine electric generating units" located in the Eastern District of
 3 Kentucky, "two new electric switching stations" located in the Eastern District of Kentucky,
 4 and a 36-mile "electric transmission line" located in the Eastern District of Kentucky, (see
 5 Compl. ¶ 3),² the "public factors" of "having localized controversies decided at home" and in
 6 avoiding "burdening citizens in an unrelated forum with jury duty" weigh heavily in favor of
 7 transfer. See Decker Coal Co. v. Commonwealth Edison Co., 805 F. 2d 834, 843 (9th Cir.
 8 1986) (identifying factors); Trout Unlimited v. United States Dep't of Agriculture, 944 F.
 9 Supp. 13, 19 (D. D.C. 1996) (noting interest in having "localized controversy decided at
 10 home is "compelling"; holding "[t]his policy rationale applies equally to the judicial review of
 11 an administrative decision which will be limited to the administrative record"); see, e.g.,
 12 Sierra Club v. Flowers, 276 F. Supp. 2d 62, 71 (D. D.C. 2003) (holding action seeking
 13 judicial review of administrative decision, to issue mining permits for certain wetlands in
 14 Southern Florida, properly transferred to Southern District of Florida; observing "depth and
 15 extent of Florida's interest is indisputable"). Indeed, the requisite public notice provided
 16 before defendant rendered its decision was provided in Kentucky, both through public
 17 meetings held in Kentucky and publication in Kentucky newspapers. See 72 FR 53526-01.
 18 Significantly, plaintiffs cite no public factor that weighs in favor of retention of the action in
 19 this District.

20 To the extent plaintiffs argue that "private factors" provide a sufficient basis to retain
 21 the matter in this district, see Decker Coal, 805 F. 2d at 843, specifically, the deference due
 22 plaintiffs' choice of forum and the inconvenience plaintiffs and their counsel may experience
 23 if the matter is transferred, the Court is not persuaded. First, plaintiffs' choice of forum is
 24 entitled to minimal deference because no part of their claims arose in the instant district.
 25 See Lou v. Belzberg, 834 F. 2d 730, 739 (9th Cir. 1989) (holding where "operative facts

26
 27 ²The subject units, stations, and transmission line are located in Clark, Madison
 28 and/or Garrard counties in Kentucky, (see id.); such counties are within in the Eastern
 District of Kentucky, see 28 U.S.C. § 97(a).

1 have not occurred” in plaintiff’s chosen forum, plaintiff’s choice is “entitled only to minimal
 2 deference”). Second, any asserted convenience to plaintiffs, each of whom is an
 3 organization, is not entitled to significant weight; one plaintiff, Kentucky Environmental
 4 Foundation, has its only office in Kentucky and appears to have no connection to California,
 5 (see Compl. ¶ 12), a second plaintiff, the Sierra Club, maintains a chapter in Kentucky with
 6 over 5000 members, (see Compl. ¶ 13), and the remaining plaintiff, the Center for
 7 Biological Diversity, has hundreds of members in Kentucky, (see Compl. ¶ 11).³ Finally,
 8 the convenience of counsel is not a recognized factor. See, e.g., In re Horseshoe
 9 Entertainment, 337 F. 3d 429, 434 (5th Cir. 2003) (holding “factor of ‘location of counsel’ is
 10 irrelevant and improper for consideration in determining the question of transfer of venue”);
 11 Solomon v. Continental American Life Ins. Co., 472 F. 2d 1043, 1047 (3rd Cir. 1973)
 12 (holding “convenience of counsel is not a factor to be considered”).

13 In sum, any convenience to plaintiffs’ counsel based on litigating the matter in this
 14 District, even if cognizable and coupled with the minimal deference afforded plaintiffs’
 15 choice of forum, is insufficient to warrant retention of the matter in this District, given the
 16 compelling interest in having local controversies decided locally and the fact that none of
 17 the operative facts occurred in this District.

18 Accordingly, the motion to transfer is hereby GRANTED, and the above-titled action
 19 is hereby TRANSFERRED to the Eastern District of Kentucky.

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21
 22 Dated: June 27, 2008

23 
 24 MAXINE M. CHESNEY
 25 United States District Judge

26 ³The Court further notes that each such plaintiff has, according to plaintiffs,
 27 members that regularly use the subject land in Kentucky for recreation and other activities.
 28 (See Compl. ¶¶ 11-13.) Evidence necessary to establish such allegation is likely to be
 located in Kentucky, not California. See, e.g., Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555,
 560-64 (1992) (holding where plaintiff organization’s standing is challenged, plaintiff must
 prove member or members have suffered “injury in fact” by reason of defendant’s
 decision).